

patents cited in the outstanding Office Action are fabricated by impregnating a dry felted preform, and these prior art casings are generally described at page 1, lines 5-17 of the instant specification. Such a felting process has numerous disadvantages, including the tendency to leave a burn residue in the combustion chamber of guns, as well as to be more water permeable than might be desired.


In contrast to the processes described in the cited prior art wherein a dry felted preform is used to make the casing, the casings employed in the present invention are suitably fabricated to overwrap the propellant by coating techniques, such as reaction injection molding, as further described at page 3 of the instant specification, to provide the desired encased propellant. Such coating techniques are suitably employed in accordance with the present invention to provide an encased propellant having a desired outer dimension.

The cited prior art neither discloses nor suggests any process for making encased propellants wherein the casing is free of cellulosic compounds, much less the instantly claimed process and composition. Accordingly, the outstanding rejections of the claims are believed to be untenable and should be withdrawn.

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice,
the Examiner is specifically authorized to call the Applicants'
Attorney collect at the number listed below if the application is
in condition for other than allowance or if prosecution can be
expedited.

June 7, 1991
Date

Respectfully submitted,


Dale Lynn Carlson
Reg. No. 28,784
Attorney for Applicants

OLIN CORPORATION
350 Knotter Drive
P.O. Box 586
Cheshire, CT 06410-0586
(203) 271-4059
2379B